



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/830,226	04/23/2001	Paul Aubrey Greenfield	09/100.000	3270
27201 7590 03/28/2007 UNISYS CORPORATION 25725 JERONIMO ROAD, MS400 MISSION VIEJO, CA 92691			EXAMINER CAO, DIEM K	
			ART UNIT 2194	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE 3 MONTHS			MAIL DATE 03/28/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/830,226	GREENFIELD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Diem K. Cao	2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 January 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-7,10-14,16-20,23-26,28,30-34 and 37-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-7,10-14,16-20,23-26,28,30-34 and 37-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

*[Signature]*  
MELANIE THOMPSON  
SENIOR PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNICAL CENTER 2100

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</p> <p>2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</p> <p>3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br/>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.</p> | <p>4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br/>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.</p> <p>5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application</p> <p>6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</p> |
|---|--|

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3-7, 10-14, 16-20, 23-26, 28, 30-34 and 37-40 are pending. Applicant has amended claims 1, 14 and 28.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1, 3-7, 10-14, 16-20, 23-26, 28, 30-34 and 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phanouriou et al. (Transforming Command-Line Driven Systems to Web Applications) in view of Eager et al. (U.S. 5,969,200) further in view of Apte et al. (U.S. 6,662,236 B1).**

As to claim 1, Phanouriou teaches a method for adapting a legacy software application (Idrag program; page 2 and abstract), created from legacy source code and developed for an environment comprising a centralized computing resource interconnected to a series of computer terminal devices (Unix computers; page 2), to a network environment (Web; page 2), wherein the network environment comprises a system of distributed, interconnected network computing resources (computers have access to Internet; page 2 and abstract), the method comprising the steps of providing a software application (Javamatic; abstract) which utilizes the legacy code to

Art Unit: 2194

produce a series of user interface software components (GUI components; page 7, section UI Mapping Rules) to provide a graphical user interface providing at least data entry and display facilities (GUI; page 2, and Figs on pages 3, pages 6-7), the graphical user interface being embodied in series of executable software components (See left middle tree of Fig. 5; page 7 and associated text) that provide the functionality for interaction with the legacy software application (anyone can visit a Web page ... When a user visits a Web page ... visualization and further analysis; page 2 and Figs. A, B, C), the components being executable by at least one of the computing resources in the network environment (The HTTP server returns an applet that is the Javamatic interface client; page 5 and Fig. 3), and wherein upon execution, the computing resource is caused to interconnect with the legacy software application over the network so as to interact with the legacy software application in the transmission or receipt of information to and from the legacy software application (Fig. 3 and associated text; pages 5-6).

Phanouriou does not explicitly teach the legacy application includes interface specification definitions which include definitions of screen formats, including data field, automatic generate a series of user interface software component, the user interface software component are generated from the screen format definitions and executable by a scripting language running on the interconnected network computing resource, and the executable software components containing object oriented methods for setting and getting values of the data fields.

However, Eager teaches the legacy application includes interface specification definitions which include definitions of screen formats (Information stored in the user interface ... structures 118; col. 23, lines 35-45), including data fields (inherent from a legacy application, and

Art Unit: 2194

application always contains data), automatic generate a series of user interface software component (target user interface definitions 213 can take one of three forms ... representation structure; col. 23, lines 17-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Phanouriou and Eager because Eager's system provides a method to transitions an entire enterprise to a distributed infrastructure.

Apte teaches the user interface software components are executable by a scripting language running on the interconnected network computing resource (JavaScript complements Java ... of an applet; col. 2, lines 38-48 and Fig. 2), and the executable software components containing object oriented methods for setting and getting values of the data fields (inherent from the language is Java, and get method provided in Appendix A; cols. 7-8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Phanouriou, Eager and Apte to the system of Phanouriou because it can expose useful properties of Java applets.

As to claim 3, Phanouriou as modified teaches the interface software components are arranged to generate forms corresponding to forms generated by the legacy software application (Figs. A, B, C and page 2).

As to claim 4, Phanouriou teaches the client interface components being arranged to interact over the network with the legacy software application (Fig. 3 and associated text; pages 5-6).

As to claim 5, Phanouriou teaches the client interface components include a user input object which is arranged to receive data input by a user of the network computing resource and transmit data to the legacy application, over the network (Figs. A, B, C, 3 and associated text).

As to claim 6, Phanouriou teaches the series of software components are loadable and executable by an Internet Browser (The HTTP server returns an applet; page 5).

As to claim 7, Phanouriou teaches the series of software components comprise Java code applet (applet; page 5 and Interface Client; page 6).

As to claim 10, Phanouriou teaches the network environment comprises the Internet network (Web page, URL; page 2).

As to claim 11, Eager teaches the network environment utilizes TCP/IP transfer protocols (TCP/IP; col. 22, lines 30-43).

As to claim 12, Phanouriou does not teach the source code is written in a 4GL language. Phanouriou teaches the legacy application in general and can be applied to multiple type of applications. It would have been obvious the legacy system of Phanouriou could also include the 4GL application.

As to claim 13, Phanouriou does not teach the source code is written in a LINC language. Phanouriou teaches the legacy application in general and can be applied to multiple types of applications. It would have been obvious the legacy system of Phanouriou could also include the LINC application.

As to claims 14 and 28, they correspond to the method claim of claim 1 except they are computer product and system claims, respectively.

As to claims 16-20, see rejections of claims 3-7 above.

As to claims 23-24, see rejections of claims 10-11 above.

As to claim 25, see rejection of claim 13 above.

As to claim 26, Eager teaches the terminal screen definitions are written in a screen control language (col. 30, lines 45-53).

As to claims 30-34, see rejections of claims 3-7 above.

As to claims 37-40, see rejections of claims 10-13 above.

***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed 1/9/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remarks, Applicant argued in substance that (1) Phanouriou, Eager and Apte fail to teach the limitation “automatically translates legacy source code interface specification definitions into an executable software component which may be executed on an interconnected network computing resource” (page 12, third paragraph), because Phanourisou teaches the GUI is generated by a person familiar with how to run the application (page 13, second paragraph), Eager teaches “GUI files 248 are used by applicant developers and maintenance personnel to modify application screens” (page 14, paragraph 5), and Apte does not teach the limitation at al.

Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments:

- As to the point (1), Eager teaches the limitation “automatically translates legacy source code interface specification definitions into an executable software component which may be executed on an interconnected network computing resource” (col. 23, lines 17-45). In this section, Eager discloses the translation step can occur automatically (col. 23, lines 17-45) or performed by user (col. 23, line 66 – col. 24, line 20). Thus, in one embodiment, Eager teaches the claimed limitation. Therefore, the arguments are not persuasive.

***Conclusion***

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).



A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Diem K. Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-3760. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30AM - 5:00PM.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571) 272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 09/830,226  
Art Unit: 2194

Page 9

DC  
March 20, 2007

  
WILLIAM A. THOMSON  
SENIOR PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100